United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



APPENDIX

ORIGINAL WITH PROOF

74 - 1795

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

for the

SECOND CIRCUIT

GEORGE J. SCHONHOLTZ.

Plaintiff-Appellant,

-against-

AMERICAN STOCK EXCHANGE INC., RAMSAY RE, FARRELL, ROCHLIN & ERDMAN and BEAR STEARNS & CO.,

Defendants-Respondents.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JOINT APPENDIX

SILVERMAN & HARNES
Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant
75 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N. Y. 10020

WINTHROP, STIMSON, PUTNAM & ROBERTS
Attorneys for Defendant-Respondent
Bear, Stearns & Co.
40 Wall Street
New York, N. Y. 10005

LORD, DAY & LORD
Attorneys for Defendant-Respondent
American Stock Exchange, Inc.
25 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10004

AUG 12 1974

AUG 12 1974

ANNIEL FUSARO, CLOST

SECOND CIRCUIT

(4235)

PAGINATION AS IN ORIGINAL COPY

INDEX TO APPENDIX

	Page
Docket Entries	A-1
Summons	A-2
Complaint	A-3
Notice of Motion dated November 27, 1973	A-9
Notice of Motion dated November 28, 1973	A-11
Affidavit of Sidney B. Silverman with Exhibits	A-12
Judge's Opinion	1-17
Notice of Appeal	A-25

DOCKET ENTRIES

GEORGE J. SCHONHULTZ vs AMERICAN STOCK EXCHANGE, INC. et al.

Sep 13-73 Filed complaint and issued summons. Sep 13-73 Piled summons and Marshala return on American Stock Exchange Inc., Rumany, Re, Farrall, Rochlin & Erduen, by Mr. Pater C. & Sec. 8-28-73, and Bear Stearns & Co., 8-30-73 Sized stip end extending deft. Remay, Referrall, Bachlin & Free et & Sec., Stearns & Co. tin to chart until Nov. 12-73, & tin for pitch to read for clear action determined in until Nov. 12-73, & tin for pitch to read for clear action determined in until Nov. 12-73, & tin for pitch to read for clear action determined in until Nov. 12-73, & tin for pitch to read for clear action determined in until Nov. 12-73, & tin for pitch to read for clear action determined in until Nov. 12-73, & tin for pitch to read for clear action determined in until Nov. 12-73, & tin for pitch to read for clear action determined in until Nov. 12-73, & tin for pitch to read untilloy. 28-73. IASKER, J. 60. 9-73 Filed stip. & order extending time for deft. Ramsay, etcto answer to 11-28-73- Lasker, J. 60. 9-73 Filed deft Bear. Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complement. Ret. 12-7-73. Filed deft summons of low in support of motion. 60. 27-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange mone in support of motion. 60. 12-74 Filed deft American Stock Exchange mone in support of motion. 60. 12-75 Filed stip of order that motion of defts Ramsoy, et al ret 12-7-73 is adjourned to 1-18-74, & motion of American Stock Exchange, 60. 12-76 Filed stip and order adjourning defts rention until Reb. 74, 1486, 1486, 1486 60. 12-76 Filed rely memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Formula in support of motion to 60. 12-76 Filed affect of Michael Dictionance retained in support of motion to 60. 12-76 Filed rely memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to 60. 12-76 Filed affect of Michael Dictionance retained pitch has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. 80. Ordered LASURA, J. (n/m) 10. 10-71 Filed Rely Offilmon 4 06079 *** We conc	DATE	PAGE 1. 73 UV. 362	Date Order
Sep 13-3 Filed summons and Marshals return on American Stock Exchange Inc., Remssy, Re, Farrall, Rochlin & Erduan, by Mr. Peter C. & Sec. 8-28-73, and Beau Staerms & Co., 8-36-75. Sterms & Co. the term with Law 12-73, & the fee pite to read a determination of the Law 12-73. At 15 fee pite to read a determination until Law 12-73, & the fee pite to read a determination until Law 12-73, & the fee pite to read a determination until Law 12-73, & the fee pite to read a determination until Law 12-73, & the fee pite to read a determination until Law 12-73, & the fee pite to read a determination until Law 12-73, & the fee pite R. J. Law 13, and the state and order extending time for deft to endow until Cos. 25-73. M.S. R.J. and the untillow. 23-73. M.S. R.J. Lasker, J. 6. 9-73 Filed stip. & order extending time for deft. Ramssy, etcto answer to 11-28-73- Lasker, J. 6. 27-73 Filed deft Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. 7. Filed deft Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. 7. Filed deft American Stock Exchange mome in support of motion. 7. Filed deft American Stock Exchange mome in support of motion. 8. Filed atip & order that motion of defts Ramsoy, et al ret 12-7-73. 8. In adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73. So Ordered Jacker, J. Filed stip and order adjourning defts notion until Feb. 3-74. IASGA, J. Filed pltffs affect in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 8. 74 Filed pltffs affect in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 8. 74 Filed rely memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss. 8. 74 Filed rely memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss. 8. 74 Filed affect of Richael DiGiovanna ret Rule 9(f) 8. 74 Filed affect of Richael DiGiovanna ret Rule 9(f) 8. 75 Filed affect of Richael DiGiovanna ret Rule 9(f) 8. 76 Filed Richael Rule 46679 *** We conclude pltf, has failed to state a Section 10(b)			
Remany, Re, Farroll, Rochlin & Erduan, by Mr. Peter C. & Sec. 8-28-73, and Boar Steerns & Co. 8-30-73. 11-2-73 Filed stip and order extending deft, Remay, by Narrell, Sachlin & France Rev., Steerns & Co. tin to come until Law, 12-73, & tin for pits, to rave for clears extical determination until Law, 12-73, & tin for pits, to rave for clears extending time for deft to end or until Cox. 25-73. MSC. 2, J. 11-2-73 Filed stip and order extending time for deft. Remsay, etcto ensuer to 11-28-73- 12-73 Filed stip, & order extending time for deft. Remsay, etcto ensuer to 11-28-73- 12-73 Filed deft Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. 12-7-73 Filed memo of law in support of motion. 27-73 Filed defts notice of motion to dismiss complaint. Ret. 10-10-73. 12-1-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 21-73 Filed stip & order that motion of defts Remsoy, et al ret 12-7-73 13 adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, 12-74 Filed stip and order adjourned to 1-18-73-75 Condered Lacker, so Filed pltffs affect in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 23-75 Filed pltffs affect in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 23-76 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss 23-77 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss 23-77 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss 23-77 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss 23-77 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss 23-77 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss 23-77 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss 23-77 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss 23-77 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss are granted. 24-78 Filed Notice of			
Size stip and order extending deft. Remay, Remail Research & Remail & Remay, Remail Research & Remay, Remail Remail & Remay, Remail & Remay, Remail & Remail		Remasy. Re. Farroll. Hochlin & Erdman, by Mr. Peter C. & Sec	,
Sternes & Co. tin to mean until May 12-73. A tin for pick, to may sternes & Co. tin to mean until May 12-73. A tin for pick, to may sternes & Co. tin to mean until Jan, 12-73. In for pick, to may for cleas extended tin until Jan, 14-73. In for pick, to may receive the stin can order extending time for deft to ender until Cos. 25-73. In St. 2, J. ov. 5-73. Filed stip and order extending time for deft. Remsay, etcto enswer to 11-28-73- Lasker, J. 607. 27-73. Filed stip. & order extending time for deft. Remsay, etcto enswer to 11-28-73- Lasker, J. 607. 27-73. Filed deft Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. 607. 27-73. Filed deft meno of law in support of motion. 607. 27-73. Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 608. 27-73. Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 609. 27-73. Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 609. 27-74. Filed stip & order that motion of defts Remsoy, et al ret 12-7-73. 609. 27-75. Filed stip & order that motion of defts Remsoy, et al ret 12-7-73. 609. 27-76. Filed stip and order adjourned to 1-18-79. Co. Ordered Lasker, J. 609. 27-77. Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. 609. 27-79. Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. 609. 609. 609. 609. 609. 609. 609. 609.		0-28-73. and Boar Stearns & Co., 8-20-73.	
Steerns & Co. the to ensure until Law, 12-73, & the for pits, to rows for cless cetted determined by until Jan, 14-74, 1408 1,1 ct. 4-73 Filed stip and order extending time for deft to endure until Can, 25-73,145 2,1. cv. 5-73 Filed stip and order extending time for deft. Ramsay, etcto answer to answer to untillious, 23-73, 145km, J. Lasker, J. Cv. 27-73 Filed stip, & order extending time for deft. Ramsay, etcto answer to 11-28-73- Lasker, J. Cv. 27-73 Filed deft Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. Cv. 27-73 Filed memo of law in support of motion. Cv. 30-73 Filed deft anotice of motion to dismiss complaint. Ret. 10-10-73. Co. 1-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. Co. 1-73 Filed stip & order that motion of defts Ramsay, etc. to answer to 11-28-73. Is adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73. So Grdered, backer, J. Filed pltffs affect in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. Co. 1-74 Filed pltffs affect in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. Co. 1-75 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss Co. 1-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss Co. 1-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss Co. 1-74 Filed affect. of Michael Diciovanna re: Rule 9(f) Co. 1-74 Filed MEMO OPINION & 46679 with We conclude pltf, has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered, LASKER, J. (n/m) V. 31, 74 Filed Notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Ro. etc.	2-73	Filed stip end orded extending doft. Remany Re. Ferrell. Rochlin & French & Prov	
For elega cetica determination until Jan. 16-75. 1400 3.J. Piled stip and order extending time for deft to ender until Cer. 23-73.160 2.J. Piled stip and order extending time for deft. American Stock Exchange to ensuer untilNov. 23-73. IASKER, J. Pov. 9-73 Filed stip. & order extending time for deft. Ramsay, etcto ensuer to 11-28-73- Lasker, J. Lasker, J. Piled deft Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. Filed defts notice of motion. Piled defts notice of motion to dismiss complaint. Ret. 10-10-73. Filed defts notice of motion of defts Ramsay, et al ret 12-7-73. Filed atip & order that motion of defts Ramsay, et al ret 12-7-73. is adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-72. Co. Grdered, Lasker, J. Piled stip and order adjourning defts. retion until Fob. 8-74. IASKOR, J. Piled pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. Piled reply memorandum of law re dismissing complaint. Piled reply memorandum of law in support of defts Ramsay re: motion to dismiss Piled reply memorandum of law in support of defts Ramsay re: motion to dismiss Piled reply memorandum of law in support of defts Ramsay re: motion to dismiss Piled reply memorandum of law in support of defts Ramsay re: motion to dismiss Piled reply memorandum of law in support of defts Ramsay re: motion to dismiss Piled RED OPINION & 40679 *** We conclude pltf, has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered, IASKER, J. (n/m) Pailed Notices fo Appeal of P. tfff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the proper of the conclude pltf, and failed notices of Appeal of P. tfff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the proper of the conclude pltf. Appeal of P. tfff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the proper of the conclude pltf. Appeal of P. tfff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the proper of the conclude pltf. Appeal of P. tfff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the prop		Steeres & Co. ties to encuer until How. 12-73. & ties for plat, to rough	
Filed stip and order extending time for deft to ender until Cec. 25-73.MSC. 2,J. v.5-73 Filed stip and order extending time for deft. American Stock Exchange to ensure untillov, 28-73. IASKER, J. v. 9-73 Filed stip. & order extending time for deft. Ramsay, etcto answer to 11-28-73- Lasker, J. Lasker, J. 27-73 Filed deft Bear. Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. 12-7-73 Filed memo of low in support of motion. 27-73 Filed defts notice of motion to dismiss complaint. Pet. 10-10-73. 28-20-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 28-21-73 Filed stip & order that motion of defts Ramsoy, et al ret 12-7-73. 18 adjourned to 1-18-74, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73Co Ordered Lasker, J. 28-74 Filed stip and order adjourning defts. retion until Feb. 8-76. IASKA, J. 28-75 Filed pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 28-76 Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. 28-77 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss 28-78 Filed affdyt. of Michael DiGiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 28-79 Filed affdyt. of Michael DiGiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 28-74 Filed MINO OPINION \$\frac{2}{2}\$ 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered. LASKER, J. (n/m) 29 31,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of P.tff. from order of Judge Lasker dated 29 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	1 22	For class action determination until Jan. 16-74, IASHER J.	
cov. 9-73 Filed stip and order extending time for deft. Remsay, etcto ensuer to 11-28-73- Lasker, J. V. 27-73 Filed stip. & order extending time for deft. Remsay, etcto ensuer to 11-28-73- Lasker, J. V. 27-73 Filed deft Bear. Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. Complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. Filed deft mano of law in support of motion. V. 30-73 Filed deft anotice of motion to dismiss complaint. Pot. 10-10-73. V. 30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. Complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. Filed stip & order that motion of defts Remsoy, et al ret 12-7-73. Is adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73. V. 20-00 dered. Lasker, J. Filed stip and order adjourning defts. motion until Feb. 8-74. Instead, J. Priled pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. Complaints E-74 Filed reply memorandum of law re dismissing complaint. Complaints E-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss E-74 Filed affdyt. of Michael Dictiovanna re: Rule 9(f) W. 10-79 Complaint Ret. Stock Exchante in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss complaint. So Ordered. Lasker, J. (1) Y. 31-74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Prtff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the support of defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. Laster, J. Laster, J. W. 27-73 Filed Notice of Appeal of Prtff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the support of defts. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roley Complex Stimson, Putnam &		Filed stip and order extending time for deft to enduer until Car. 25-73.118-2.1	
untilloy.28-73. IASKER, J. Lasker, J. Ov. 27-73 Filed deft Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismise the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. Filed deft Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismise the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. Filed meno of law in support of motion. V.30-73 Filed defts notice of motion to dismise complaint. Pot. 10-10-73. Ov. 30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. Ov. 30-73 Filed stip & order that motion of defts Ramsoy, et al ret 12-7-73 is adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73. So Ordered, Lacker, J. Filed stip end order adjourning defts, motion until Feb. 1-74, IASKAI, Filed pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismise complaint. C-71 Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. C-71 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismise. C-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismise. C-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismise. C-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts. Ramsay re: motion to dismise. C-74 Filed Memo original # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismise are granted. So Ordered, LASKER, J. (n/m) Y 31, 74 Filed Notice of Appeal of P.tff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the state and state and the state and the state and state	OV.3-13	liled stip and order extending time for deft. American Stock Exchange to answer	
Filed deft Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. 604-27-73 Filed meno of law in support of motion. 730-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 804-30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 804-30-73 Filed stip & order that motion of defts Remsoy, ot al ret 12-7-73 is adjourned to 1-18-74, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73. Co. Greened, Lasker, J. Filed stip and order adjourning defts, motion until Feb. 8-74. LASO 8.1. 80-74 Filed pltffs affdvt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 80-74 Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. 80-74 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss. 80-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss. 80-74 Filed affdvt. of Michael Dictiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 90-74 Filed affdvt. of Michael Dictiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 90-74 Filed Med. OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. 80 Ordered. LASKER, J. (n/m) 90-81-81 Filed Notice of Appeal of P.tff. from order of Judge Lasker dated Nation 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Winthrop Stimson, Putnam & Rocketter 10(18-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-1	0-77	tinfillose 28-73 TACKED T	
Complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. Filed memo of law in support of motion. Complaint. Ret. 12-7-73. Filed deft memican Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. Filed stip & order that motion of defts Remsoy, et al ret 12-7-73. Is adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73. Complaint. Filed stip and order adjourning defts. motion until Feb.8-74. LASO 8.1. Filed stip and order adjourning defts. motion to dismiss complaint. Filed pltffs affdvt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. Complaint. Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. Complaint. Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss. Complaint. Complaint. Complaint. Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Remsay re: motion to dismiss. Complaint. Comp	000	Filed stip. & order extending time for deft. Ramsay, etcto answer to 11-28-73-	
Filed memo of law in support of motion. 7.30-73 Filed defts notice of motion to dismiss complaint. Pot. 10-10-73. 8.30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 8.30-73 Filed stip & order that motion of defts Ramsoy, et al ret 12-7-73. 8.10 is adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, 8.20-74 Filed stip and order adjourning defts. motion until Feb.8-74, IASO 1, J. 8.30-74 Filed pltffs affect in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 8.30-74 Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. 8.30-74 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss. 8.50-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss. 8.50-74 Filed affect. of Michael DiGiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 8.50-74 Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. 8.50 Ordered. LASKER.J. (n/m) 8.71 Filed Notice of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the Conclude of the Conclude state of Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded to Lasker dated b		Lagrad . J.	
Filed memo of law in support of motion. 7.30-73 Filed defts notice of motion to dismiss complaint. Pot. 10-10-73. 8.30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 8.30-73 Filed stip & order that motion of defts Ramsoy, et al ret 12-7-73. 8.10 is adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, 8.20-74 Filed stip and order adjourning defts. motion until Feb.8-74, IASO 1, J. 8.30-74 Filed pltffs affect in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 8.30-74 Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. 8.30-74 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss. 8.50-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss. 8.50-74 Filed affect. of Michael DiGiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 8.50-74 Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. 8.50 Ordered. LASKER.J. (n/m) 8.71 Filed Notice of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the Conclude of the Conclude state of Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Conclude state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded state of Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roughle Concluded to Lasker dated by the Concluded to Lasker dated b	01061	Filed dert Bear, Stearns & Co. Notice of motion to dismiss the	
10v. 30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 10v. 30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 10v. 30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 10v. 30-73 Filed stip & order that motion of defts Remsoy, et al ret 12-7-73 10v. 30-74 Filed stip and order adjourned to 1-18-71. So Ordered, Exchange, 10v. 2-74 Filed stip and order adjourning defts, motion until Reb. 8-74 LASO 3. J. 10v. 2-74 Filed pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 10v. 2-74 Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. 10v. 2-74 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss. 10v. 2-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss. 10v. 2-74 Filed affdyt. of Michael Dictiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 10v. 2-74 Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. 10v. 2-74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated and the state of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated and the state of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff Appeal of P			
10v. 30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 10v. 30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 10v. 30-73 Filed deft American Stock Exchange memo in support of motion. 10v. 30-73 Filed stip & order that motion of defts Remsoy, et al ret 12-7-73 10v. 30-74 Filed stip and order adjourned to 1-18-71. So Ordered, Exchange, 10v. 2-74 Filed stip and order adjourning defts, motion until Reb. 8-74 LASO 3. J. 10v. 2-74 Filed pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. 10v. 2-74 Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. 10v. 2-74 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss. 10v. 2-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss. 10v. 2-74 Filed affdyt. of Michael Dictiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 10v. 2-74 Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. 10v. 2-74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated and the state of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated and the state of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roughest Canada and the state of Appeal of Pitff Appeal of P	30.73	Filed meno of law in support of motion.	
Filed stip & order that motion of defts Ramsoy, et al ret 12-7-73 is adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73	y e 3 9 - 1 3	of Filed dotte notice of motion to dismit	
is adjourned to 1-18-71, & motion of American Stock Exchange, ret. 12-10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73So Ordered Lasker, J. Filed stip and order adjourning defts. motion until Feb.8-74. IASGA, J. Filed pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss 8-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss 8-74 Filed affdyt. of Michael Didiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 9-2(-70) Filed MINO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered. LASKER, J. (n/m) 131,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Putff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the filed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roberts			
ret. 12=10-73, is adjourned to 1-18-73So Ordered Lacker, J. Filed stip and order adjourning defts. motion until Feb.8-74. LASION, J. Filed pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss 8-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss 8-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss 9-74 Filed affdyt. of Michael Diciovanna re: Rule 9(f) 9-74 Filed MIND OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered. LASKER, J. (n/m) 131,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Putff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by 6 Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roberts	College.	The death that morion of delta Romany of ol mot 12 7 72	
Filed stip and order adjourning defts. motion until Feb. 8-74. IASKOR, J. Filed pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss Filed affdyt. of Michael Dictionance re: Rule 9(f) Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered. IASKER, J. (n/m) Mailed Notice of Appeal of Putff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the state of the st		The state of the s	1
Filed pltffs affdyt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint. Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss Filed affdyt. of Michael DiGiovanna re: Rule 9(f) Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679/ *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered, LASKER, J. (n/m) y 31,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Putff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the deft of the state of Appeal of Putff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the state of Appeal of Putff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the state of Appeal of Putff. Winthropy Stimson, Putnam & Roberts	C-76	19 00 1011mn 00 PO 1-18 77 C. C. J. J.	L
Filed pltffs memo of law re dismissing complaint. 6. 6-71 Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss 6. 8-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss 6. 8-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss 6. 8-74 Filed affect. of Michael Diciovanna re: Rule 9(f) 7-26-79 Procedular Accordance for the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. 8. 8-74 Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. 8. 8-74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Putff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by 6 Mailed Notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roserts	3.71	Filed stip and order adjourning detts, motion until Keb. 8-74, LASOR, J.	
Filed reply memorandum of deft. Amer. Stock Exchante in support of motion to dismiss 8-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts Ramsay re: motion to dismiss 8-74 Filed affect. of Michael DiGiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 9-76-79 Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered, LASKER, J. (n/m) y 31,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by 6 Mailed Notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roberts	-23-71	Filed pittis arrayt in opposition to motion to dismiss complaint.	1
8-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss 9-26-74 Filed affdyt. of Michael DiGiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 9-26-74 Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered, LASKER, J. (n/m) y 31,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by 6 Mailed Notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roberts			
8-74 Filed reply memorandum of law in support of defts' Ramsay re: motion to dismiss 9-26-74 Filed affdyt. of Michael DiGiovanna re: Rule 9(f) 9-26-74 Filed MEMO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered, LASKER, J. (n/m) y 31,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Pitff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by 6 Mailed Notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roberts			
9-26-79 Pre-trief hear hard for the filed MELO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered, LASKER, J. (n/m) 131,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Patff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by to hailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roberts	8-71	Filed reply memorandum of lastin comment of the second	
y 6-74 Filed MENO OPINION # 40679 *** We conclude pltf. has failed to state a Section 10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted. So Ordered. LASKER, J. (n/m) y 31,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Patff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by 6 Mailed Notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Roberts		distribution of inchaef biolovalina re: inite 9(1)	
So Ordered, LASKER, J. (n/m) 13 (1) 4 Filed Notice of Appeal of Patff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by the Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices of Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolley of Mailed notices of Mailed not	7-16-16	1 Cre-triel heave follow	
So Ordered, LASKER, J. (n/m) y 31,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Patff. from order of Judge Lasker dated by 6 Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolens	process with the section the same water . As	The state of the s	
y 31,74 Filed Notice of Appeal of Patff. from order of Judge Lasker dated May 6 Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolens		10(b) claim against any of the defts. Motions to dismiss are granted	
Mailed notices to Lord, Day &Lord Winthropp Stimson, Putnam & Rolevas		So Ordered, LASKER.J. (n/m)	
Mailed notices to lord Day Mord: Winthron Stimen Butner & Bo	y 31,	14 Filed Notice of Appeal of Patff. from order of Judge Lasker dated	May 16,
		Mailed notices to lord Day Mord: Winthrong Stimen Dutner & De	Serus.
27 31-74 Filed notice of pltffs attorneys of change of address.			
	27 31-10	Filed notice of pltffs attorneys of change of address.	
			+ -
			CONTRACTOR SERVICE

SUMMONS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

GEORGE J. SCHONHOLTZ) Civil Action File No.) 73 Civ 3689
Plaintiff)
v.) JUDGE MORRIS E. LASKER
AMERICAN STOCK EXCHANGE, INC., RAMSAY, RE, FARRELL, ROCHLIN & ERDMAN and BEAR STEARNS & CO.)) SUMMONS)
Defendant)))

To the above named Defendant:

You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon SILVER-MAN & HARNES plaintiff's attorneys, whose address is One Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. 10020 an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

/s/ Raymond F. Burghardt
Clerk of Court.

/s/ G. Harbison
Deputy Clerk.

Date: August 24, 1973.

[Seal of Court]

UNITED	STA	TES	DIST	RIC	r cot	URT	
SOUTHE	RN	DISTR	ICT	OF	NEW	YORK	
							 x

(SAME TITLE)

Plaintiff, by his attorneys, Silverman & Harnes, alleges upon information and belief as follows:

JURISDICTIONAL ALLEGATIONS

1. The jurisdiction of this Court is based upon the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act), §§1 through 34, as amended (15 U.S.C. §78aa et seq.) and in particular upon §§6, 10b, 20 and 27 (15 U.S.C. §§78(f), (j), (t) and (aa)), Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 10b-5, (17 C.F.R. 240.10b-5) Rules 170 and 177 of the American Stock Exchange Rules of Board - Conduct of Business and the Constitution of the American Stock Exchange, Art. II, Sec. 2.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS PURSUANT TO CIVIL RULE 11a

2. (a) (i) Plaintiff sold short on August 4, 1971 and August 11, 1971 an aggregate of 200 shares of common stock of Levitz Furniture Corporation (Le itz). On August 17, 1971 plaintiff covered his short sales by purchasing shares of Levitz common stock at prices in excess of the short sale prices. The short sales and the covering transaction were executed through the facilities of defendant American Stock Exchange

Inc. (AMEX).

- (ii) Defendant AMEX is registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) as a national securities exchange pursuant to Section 6 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. \$78f). It is located at 86 Trinity Place, New York, New York.
- (iii) Defendant Ramsay, Re, Farrell, Rochlin and Erdman (Ramsay Re) is a firm of specialists responsible for maintaining an orderly market in certain securities. From October 20, 1969 to August 24, 1971 Ramsay Re acted as the specialist for the common stock of Levitz.
- (iv) Defendant Bear, Stearns & Co. (Bear Stearns) directly and indirectly controls Ramsay Re. It directly and indirectly induced the wrongful activity set forth herein.
- (v) Plaintiff brings this action individually and representatively against defendants and on behalf of all other persons who purchased Levitz common stock on the AMEX during the period October 20, 1969 to August 24, 1971 in order to cover a short position.
- (b) This action can be maintained as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- (c) The common stock of Levitz was listed, registered and traded on the AMEX. From at least October 20, 1969 to August 24, 1971, defendant Ramsay Re acted as the specialist in that stock.

The members of the class plaintiff seeks to represent are all persons who sold short common stock of Levitz and covered such short sales by purchase of Levitz common stock during the period October 20, 1969 to August 24, 1971.

- (d) Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the class. His claim is typical of the claim which any class member could assert and his interest does not conflict with the interest of any other class member. The class is estimated to number many thousands of persons.
- (e) Common questions of law and fact include (i) whether defendants maintained a fair and orderly market in Levitz common stock; (ii) whether there was sufficient Levitz common stock available "in the float" to meet the requirements of short sellers; (iii) whether a "float" insufficient to meet the requirements of short sellers in Levitz common stock developed which defendants knew, or in the exercise of the standards of care imposed upon them should have known; and (iv) whether the class sustained injuries as a result of any illegal or improper conduct engaged in by defendants.
- (f) A class action is superior to other available methods because (i) the class members sustained relatively small losses and hence would have little interest in maintaining control of individual actions; (ii) to the best of plaintiff's knowledge, no member has as yet

commenced an action, so that a class action on behalf of such members will not deprive a class member of any rights; and (iii) there are no difficulties likely to be encountered in the maintenance of this suit as a class action.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

- 4. During the relevant period, Levitz had 5,573,895 shares of its common stock issued and outstanding (as adjusted for a 2-for-1 stock split in June, 1971). Officers of Levitz, their relatives, and a partnership of which certain of the controlling persons of Levitz were partners, owned approximately 2 million of the aforesaid shares. Institutional investors such as investment companies registered with the SEC ("mutual funds"), banks, insurance companies and private hedge funds owned approximately 2.2 million shares. Thus, there was available to the investing public for trading approximately 1.3 million shares. The short interest in Levitz common stock was approximately 70,000 shares during the same period. Under all such circumstances, including the aforementioned substantial short interest, all of which defendants knew or should have known, the shares of Levitz common stock available for trading were inadequate to insure a fair, honest and orderly market in Levitz.
- 5. The AMEX represents and warrants to the public in its SEC registration statement, its constitution, rules and advertisements

that the securities listed and traded on its facilities are subject to rigorous scrutiny to insure that a fair, honest, and orderly market for such securities is maintained. In AMEX listed securities, the responsibility for maintaining an orderly market is shared by the AMEX and the specialist which the AMEX assigns to make a market in the Securities. The AMEX and the specialist have the responsibility to insure that members of the public can buy and sell securities at prices which are free from artificially inflated prices caused by a floating supply which is inadequate to meet the public demand.

- 6. Beginning at least on October 20, 1969 and continuing through August 24, 1971, the common stock of Levitz traded on the AMEX at artificially high prices created by a limited and inadequate supply of Levitz common stock. The fact of such limited and inadequate supply of Levitz common stock was or should have been known to defendants.
- 7. Plaintiff and the class were damaged when they covered their short positions in Levitz common stock by purchasing such stock at an artificially high price created by the inadequacy of the floating supply.
- 8. Defendants AMEX, Bear Stearns, and Ramsay Re knew or should have known that there was an inadequate supply of Levitz common stock, should not have allowed Levitz common stock to trade on

the AMEX at artificially inflated prices, and should have promptly suspended trading therein.

- The AMEX and Bear, Stearns knew, or should have known, that Ramsay, Re was unable to maintain a fair and orderly market in Levitz common stock. By their failure to supervise Ramsey, Re in the performance of its duties as AMEX specialist in Levitz stock, defendants AMEX and Bear, Stearns aided and abetted, induced and contributed to the wrongful conduct complained of herein.
- 10. Had plaintiff and the class been adequately informed by the defendants of the material facts as to an inadequate floating supply of common stock, they would not have sold short.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment:

- 1. Declaring that this action can be maintained as a class suit;
- Requiring defendants to pay to plaintiff and the class losses sustained:
- Awarding plaintiff his costs and expenses, including accounting and legal fees; and
- 4. Granting such other and furthe elief as may be just and proper.

Dated: New York, N. Y. August 15, 1973

SACHS, GREENEBAUM & TAYLOR, Office & P. O. Address Of Counsel 1620 Eye St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20006

/s/ Silverman & Harnes SILVERMAN & HARNES. Attorneys for Plaintiff 1 Rockefeller Plaza New York, N. Y. 10020

NOTICE OF MOTION DATED NOVEMBER 27, 1973

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

(SAME TITLE)

SIRS:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that upon the pleadings, the undersigned will move this Court in Room 2903 the United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York, New York, on the 7th day of December, 1973, at 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, pursuant to Rule 9 of the General Rules of this Court,

- (a) for an order, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, dismissing the complaint as to alleged defendant Ramsay, Re, Farrell, Rochlin & Erdman and defendant Bear, Stearns & Co. on the ground that the Court lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action; and
- (b) for such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York November 27, 1973

NOTICE OF MOTION DATED NOVEMBER 27, 1973

WINTHROP, STIMSON, PUTNAM & ROBERTS

By /s/ John B. Daniels

A Member of the Firm

Attorneys for Defendant BEAR, STEARNS & CO. Office and P.O. Address 40 Wall Street New York, New York 10005 Tel. No. (212) WH-3-0700

TO:

SILVERMAN & HARNES Attorneys for Plaintiff One Rockefeller Plaza New York, New York 10020

LORD, DAY & LORD
Attorneys for Defendant
American Stock Exchange Inc.
25 Broadway
New York, New York 10004

NOTICE OF MOTION DATED NOVEMBER 28, 1973

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

(SAME TITLE)

SIRS:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that upon the pleadings herein, the undersigned will move this Court before the Hon. Morris E. Lasker at Room No. 2903, United States Court House, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., on December 10, 1973, at 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, or at such other time and place as the Court shall direct, for an order pursuant to Rule 12(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, dismissing the complaint for lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and for such other and further relief as is just and proper.

Dated: New York, N. Y. November 28, 1973

Yours, etc.

LORD, DAY & LORD

By /s/ John J. Joflin

(A Member of the Firm)

TO: SILVERMAN & HARNES, ESQS. Attorneys for Defendant

Attorneys for Plaintiff
1 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N. Y.

American Stock Exchange, Inc.
25 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10004

AFFIDAVIT OF SIDNEY B. SILVERMAN, FOR PLAINTIFF, IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION

UNITED	STATES	DISTRIC	T COL	JRT	
SOUTHE	RN DIST	RICT OF	NEW	YORK	
			··		

(SAME TITLE)

STATE OF NEW YORK)

: ss.:
COUNTY OF NEW YORK)

SIDNEY B. SILVERMAN, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am a member of Silverman & Harnes, attorneys for plaintiff in the above entitled action. I submit this affidavit in opposition to the motion made by defendants for an order dismissing the complaint.

As reflected in plaintiff's memorandum of law submitted herewith, on motions to dismiss, such as the instant one, the allegations of the complaint are deemed to be true and every inference favorable to the validity of the claim should be drawn. For the Court's convenience, annexed hereto and marked Exhibit "A" is a copy of the complaint. In essence, the complaint charges that the defendants engaged in a trade, practice or course of conduct which amounted to a fraud and deception upon plaintiff and other members of the proposed class. Specifically, plaintiff sold short common stock of Levitz and covered such short sales during the period when Levitz stock was listed and traded upon

AFFIDAVIT OF SIDNEY B. SILVERMAN, FOR PLAINTIFF, IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION

the American Stock Exchange. Plaintiff contends that his covering transactions in Levitz stock were made at artificially high prices. Institutional interest in the stock had tied up a large portion of the floating supply. As a result, the price of Levitz stock was not at that time determined by free market conditions but was, rather, artificially inflated as a result of the inadequate quantity available to meet the demand of purchasers for that stock. Plaintiff charges that it was the duty of the defendants under rules enacted for the protection of investors, to maintain an orderly market in Levitz stock and that the failure to maintain such a market violates both the rules of the American Stock Exchange and the provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Defendants contend that plaintiff's action, if sustained, will open the flood gates to similar litigation based upon a disappointed investor's claim that an orderly market was not maintained. Defendants' argument is not pertinent to the instant situation. The short supply of Levitz common stock and the absence of an orderly market therein were the subject of review not only by the SEC, but also by the Attorney General of the State of New York. Exhibits "B" and "C" are examples of the attention given to the extraordinary circumstances that a corner may have developed in Levitz common stock. My review of reported decisions reflects that this case presents the first instance since the adoption of the Exchange Act that a charge has been made that a corner

AFFIDAVIT OF SIDNEY B. SILVERMAN, FOR PLAINTIFF, IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION

existed in a listed security. One case in 40 years hardly raises the spectre of a flood of litigation.

I believe that defendants' motion is ill-founded and should be denied. A review of the facts and pertinent authorities bearing thereon is contained in plaintiff's memorandum of law.

/s/ Sidney B. Silverman
Sidney B. Silverman

Verified January 18, 1974.

121-21972

FINANCE

Check Finds Few Shares of Levitz Available to Trade

By ROBERT METZ New York Times News Service

One of the biggest guessing games on Wall Street is estimating how many shares are in the Levitz Furniture Corp. "float" — shares actually available for trading on the New York Stock Exchange.

Clearly, a very substantial number of Levitz' 5,572,435 shares are closely held. The question some sophisticated investors are asking — the shorts as well as those who are long in the stock — is whether so many Levitz shares are locked up on the hands of a small group of large holders as to constitute a veritable corner on the stock.

(The opening of Levitz Furniture was formally delayed in opening on the New York Stock Exchange today by an influx of orders. The issue did not trade yesterday and on the previous day it declined 17 points to 13742. On that day, it was reported that the New York State attorney general's office was investigating mutual funds' role in sharp earlier gains in the issue.)

Just how many shares are there available for trading? It's anyone's guess, but here's one estimate pieced together by 'o bservers who have watched the stock. The Levitz family owns about 2 million shares. Mutual funds which report their holdings owned 1.3 million shares on Sept. 30. It is likely they owned more on Dec. 31, but the figures are not as yet available.

The Kaplan-Nathan & Co. hedge fund of which two Levitz brothers were, until recently at least, partners, owned 125,000 shares. Meanwhile, two leading New York City banks, held, according to a persistent rumor, 1.1 million Levitz shares. This could not be confirmed.

Street rumors have it that

other private hedge funds have 200,000 shares while another 300,000 shares are said to be in the hands of insurance companies.

Remember that many investment advisers to mutual funds also manage money in discretionary accounts and some also manage pension fund money. It's likely that they would buy shares of Levitz for their other accounts. Now figure that short covering would eat up about 99.090 shares and this leaves a free float of very few shares. Forget about the discretionary accounts and the pension funds and you have 5,573,435 minus perhaps 5,225,000 — if you believe the rumors — or about 350,000 shares.

When you figure the volume in Levitz, the float is about a five-day supply in terms of this week's trading.

How, then, can you have an orderly market with no supply and no way for a bear to go short. Meanwhile, the stock exchange has cancelled standing stop orders to sell at specified prices so that a seller must take the initiative to get out. But the exchange has not attempted to temper the volative wide swings by putting in a 160 percent margin requirement.

Meanwhile, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith dopped its long-term buy recommendation today and now has no oppinion on the stock.

EXHIBIT C TO SILVERMAN AFFIDAVIT - NEWSPAPER ARTICLE

N. Y. Times

FEB 2 1972

Market Place: Levitz's 'Float': How Big Is It?

By ROBERT METZ

The biggest guessing game in town is estimating how many shares, are in the Levitz Furniture Corporation's "float"—shares actually available for trading on the New York Stock Exchange.

Clearly, a very substantial number of Levitz's 5,573,435 shares are closely held. The question some sophisticated investors are asking — the shorts as well as those who are long—is whether so many Levitz shares are locked up in the hands of a small group of large holders as to constitute a veritable corner on the stock.

If you're one of the few investors who own Levitz shares—would you believe a recent \$40-milhon stock of-fering added only 300 or so to the 2,130 record holders who had owned the shares?

—you no doubt know the Levitz furniture "concept."

The Levitz prothers have opened warei-ouse-salesrooms in a dozen states to sell furniture at a discount, but without, of course, the usual financial fril's. So far there, are 31 stores, with nine more under construction and more—many more—on the way, hopefully indicates Raigh Levitz, the ebullient chairman.

It's a high cash-flow operation since most customers do elect to lay it on the barrel and thus help provide the wherewithal for more inventory. New stores are financed through private investor groups and thus the company has relatively little debt.

Ralph Levitz brags that the company pays no dividends and thus the cash cost of equity financings are, as they say, zip. The Levitz brothers and family took down some \$20-million of that recent \$40-million financing in selling personal shares. Many are asking pointed questions about the ability of the Levitzes to run more and more stores, especially since competition looms.

None of these considerations have cooled Wall Street's ardor and the stock has been a big winner with a 1971-72 high of 15914. Its low was 30 and a fraction. Trading haits recently have seen wide fluctuations and the stock was last traded on Monday. It closed with a 17point loss at 13714 after two trading halts and on a volume

of 53,500 shares.

That same day, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the New York State Attorney General's office and the New York Stock Exchange all said they were investigating, but the company denied that any of them had

contacted it yesterday.

Just how many shares are there available for trading? It's anyone's guess, but here's one estimate pieced together by observers who have watched the stock. The Levitz family owns about two million shares. Mutual funds that report their holdings owned 1.3 million shares on Sept. 20. It is likely they owned more on Dec. 31, but the figures are not as yet available.

The Kaplan-Nathan & Co. heage fund of which two Levitz brothers were, until recently at least, partners, owned 125,000 shares. Meanwhile, two leading New York City banks held, according to a persistent rumor, 1.1 million Levitz shares. This could not be confirmed yesterday.

Street rumors have it that other private hedge funds have 300,000 shares while another 300,000 shares are said to be in the hands of insurance companies.

Remember that many investment advisers to mutual funds also manage money in discretionary accounts and some also manage pension-tund money. It's likely that they would buy shares of Levitz for their other accounts. Now figure that short covering would eat up about 99,000 shares and this leaves a free float of very few shares. Forget about the discretionary accounts and the pension funds and you have 5,573,435 minus perhaps 5,225,000—if you believe the rumors—or about 350,000 shares.

When you figure the volume in Levitz, the float is about a five-day supply in terms of this week's trading.

How, then, can you have an orderly market with no supply and no way for a bear to go snort. Meanwhile, the stock exchange has canceled standing stop orders to sell at specified prices so that a seller must take the initiative to get out. But the exchange has not attempted to temper the volatile wide swings by putting in a 100 per cent margin requirement.

This would make the day trader put up the full cost of the shares ratner than 55 per cent and might dampen the upswings. One short-trader asks: "Why don't they protect us the way they seem to be protecting those who are long the stock? Letting the market react without trading halts might also have a leveling effect." Shorts also complain that they couldn't borrow stock to increase their short positions.

Meanwhile, Merrill Lynch, Pierce Fenner & Smith, dropped its long-term buy recommendation yesterday and now has no opinion.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

GEORGE J. SCHONHOLTZ,

Plaintiff,

-against-

73 Civ. 3689

AMERICAN STOCK EXCHANGE INC., RAMSAY, RE, FARRELL, ROCHLIN & ERDMAN and BEAR, STEARNS & CO.,

MEMORANDUM

Defendants.

APPEARANCES:

SILVERMAN & HARNES, ESQS. One Rockefeller Plaza New York, New York 10020 Attorneys for Plaintiff

LORD, DAY & LORD, ESQS.
25 Broadway
New York, New York 10004
Attorneys for Defendant AMERICAN STOCK EXCHANGE, INC.

WINTHROP, STIMSON, PUTNAM & ROBERIS, ESQS. 40 Wall Street
New York, New York 10005
Attorneys for Defendant BEAR, STEARNS & CO.

LASKER, D.J.

In August, 1971, plaintiff sold short 200 shares of Levitz Corporation stock on the American Stock Exchange (Amex) and subsequently covered the sale at a substantial loss. He brings this action against Amex, the firm of Ramsay, Re, Farrell, Kachlin & Erdman (specialists in Levitz stock) (Ramsay) and Bear, Stearns & Co. (Bear, Stearns) Ramsay's parent. In substance the complaint alleges/at the time of the events in question the common stock of Levitz traded on the Amex at "artificially high prices created by a limited and inadequate supply of Levitz common stock" (Paragraph 6); that this was known or should have been known by defendants; and that plaintiff (and the class of short sellers of Levitz he seeks to represent) were damaged "when they covered their short positions ... by purchasing stock at an artificially high price created by the inadequacy of the floating supply." (Paragraph 7.) Plaintiff claims that defendants should "not have allowed" Levitz to trade at such artificially inflated prices and should have promptly suspended trading in the stock.

Jurisdiction is predicated upon §§6, 10(b), 20 and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. §§78(f), (j)(b)(t) and (aa), Rules 170 and 177 of the

American Stock Exchange Rules and the Amex Constitution.

Defendants move pursuant to Rule 12(b), Federal Rules of

Civil Procedure, to dismiss the complaint for failure to

state a claim.

I.

171:11:7:11

The motion to dismiss the \$10(b) claims against all defendants is granted. Plaintiff charges that defendant Amex failed to supervise Ramsay in the discharge of Ramsay's obligation as a specialist, pursuant to Amex Rules, to "maintain a fair and orderly market," and that Amex, Ramsay, and Bear, Stearns (as controlling person of Ramsay) were under a duty to disclose that the market in Levitz stock was not in fact fair and orderly.

However, even taking these allegations as true, cffirst. they do not state a \$10(b) claim. Both Rule 9(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and decisions of this Circuit require that the circumstances constituting a \$10(b) claim be stated with particularity and that merely conclusory allegations of fraud are insufficient to state a \$10(b) claim. The present complaint fails those requirements. Plaintiff's claim boils down to the assertion that defendants impliedly represented to the public that there was an adequate floating supply of Levitz stock; that plaintiff relied on this representation; that the

floating supply was actually "inadequate" (Paragraph 8); that price movements in the stock were accentuated as a consequence; and that defendants were under a duty to disclose these facts and halt trading in the stock (Paragraph 8).

There exists no legal duty or rule of the Amex requiring disclosure of the fact that only 1.3 million shares of Levitz were available for public trading or indicating that such a lot is per se inadequate to assure an orderly market as contemplated by Rule 170. Exhibit D annexed to the Reply Memorandum of Amex sets forth the delisting policies of the Amex. The relevant section provides for delisting of a security where "(a) if the number of shares publicly held (exclusive of holdings of officers, directors, controlling shareholders or other family or concentrated holdings) is less than 150,000. " Plaintiff's own allegations establish that the Amex complied with this policy. Rule 170 of the Amex, relating to the functions of specialists, (see Exhibit A, Amex Reply Memorandum) sets forth the general obligation of specialists "to engage in a course of dealings for his own account to assist in the maintenance, insofar as reasonably practicable, of a fair and orderly market." (emphasis added.) Other provisions of the rule detail

the kinds of transactions the specialist is either obligated to enter where practicable, in the performance of his duty, (such as dealing "for his own account in full lots when lack of price continuity or lack of depth in the full lot market exists...") or prohibited from entering (such as a purchase at a price above the last sale in the same trading session). Rule 177 provides that a specialist shall report to a floor official of the Amex any unusual activity or price change in a security, or material information regarding the issue or the market in it. The complaint alleges no violations of any of these specific duties. Even assuming the trading in Levitz stock was hectic or even dangerous, plaintiff points to no recognized legal duty on the part of any of defendants to disclose that fact, or any action or omission by defendants which amounted even to negligence, much less securities law fraud. See Shemtob v. Shearson, Hammill & Co., 448 F.2d 442 (2d Cir. 1971), Segal v. Gordon, 467 F.2d 602 (2d Cir. 1972). We conclude plaintiff has failed to state a \$10(b) claim against any of the defendants.

II.

Plaintiff's claims arising out of the alleged violations of exchange rules are also dismissed as to all

defendants. Even assuming that Amex rules were violated (although, as noted above, the complaint does not detail how), the few courts presented with the issue have held , that violations of exchange rules are not per se actionable by private parties. In Colonial Realty Corp. v. Bache & Co., 358 F.2d 178, 182 (1966), Judge Friendly noted that violation of some exchange rules might provide the basis for a private cause of action "with the party urging the implication of a federal liability carrying a considerably heavier burden of persuasion then when the violation is of the statute or an SEC Regulation." In declining to imply a private cause of action for - violation of §6 of the NYSE constitution providing for disciplinary action against members guilty "of conduct or promeeding inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade," Judge Friendly noted the phrase was "something of a catch-all ... including merely unethical behavior which Congress could well not have intended to give rise to a legal claim," 358 F.2d at 182 cand warned that "mere recitation of the statutory watchword by an aggrieved investor would saddle the federal courts with garden-variety customer-broker suits ... " (358 F.2d at 183).

Judge Friendly's admonition has been taken

seriously by other courts presented with the same issue: no case of which we are aware has found an implied right of action for the violation per se of an exchange rule; allegations of such violation have been held to state a claim only where coupled with sufficient allegations of fraud on the investor. Buttrey v. Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, 410 F.2d 135 (7th Cir. 1969), cert. denied 396 U.S. 838 (1969) (N.Y.S.E. Rule 405, the "know your customer rule," actionable in conjunction with allegations of fraud), Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. v. Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, '69-70 Transfer Binder, CCH Fed. Sec. L. Rep. ¶92,748 (N.D. Ill. 1970) (alleged violation of Rule 405 amounting to mere negligence failed to state a claim) accord, McMaster Hutchinson & Co. v. Rothschild & Co., 1972-73 Transfer Dinder, CCH Fed. Sec. L. Rep. ¶93,541 (N.D. Ill. 1972); Bush v. Bruns Nordeman & Co., 1972-73 Transfer Binder, CCH Fed. Sec. L. Rep. ¶93,674 (S.D.N.Y. 1972) (alleged violations of Rule 405 "inextricably linked" with \$10(b) claims stated a claim). cases guide us here. Since we have found that plaintiff has failed to state a \$10(b) claim, his allegations regarding violation of Amex rules, taken alone, do not state a claim.

The motions to dismiss are granted. It is so ordered.

Dated: New York, New York MORRIS R. LASKET

U.S.D.J.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

(SAME TITLE)

Notice is hereby given that George J. School itz, plaintiff above named, hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from the order of Hon. Morris E. Lasker, entered on the docket on May 6, 1974, granting defendants' motions to dismiss the complaint.

DATED: New York, N.Y. May 30, 1974 SILVERMAN & HARNES, ESQS.

By: SIDNEY B. SILVERMAN
A Member of the Firm
Attorneys for Plaintiff
75 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10019

Received 3 copies of the within

James Copies of the within

this day of any, 1974.

Sign C. Welland.

Sign Stimen Lutnam

For: 1 Roberts Esq(s).

Att'ys for Defrant Respondences

Bear Steams To.

Received 3 copies of the within fount appealing 1974.

this /Zday of any , 1974.

Sign Raus Baroh

For: ford flay & Ford Esq(s).

Att'ys for Defended Regional and Stock Enchange for.